

Appl. No. 10/710,340  
Amdt. dated March 23, 2007  
Reply to Office action of November 27, 2006

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

Fig. 5 has been amended to include reference signs as described in paragraph [0087] of the specification, and should be found compliant with 37 CFR 1.121(d). The amended drawing has been titled "Replacement Sheet", and has been attached following page 10 of  
5 this paper

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (for Fig. 5)

1 page(s)

## REMARKS

### Response to Claim Rejections

*Claims 1-7, 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Faroudja (US 5,305,120)*

5           Applicant asserts that Faroudja does not fully teach the limitations provided in claims 1-7 and 16-20 of the present invention, as discussed below.

          Regarding claim 1, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 2 and 5, with claims 2 and 5 subsequently cancelled. No additional subject matter was included in this amendment. In light of this amendment, applicant asserts that Faroudja  
10       does not teach the limitation “*obtaining a first difference set between pixel information...the target pixel in the first odd field (emphasis added) and the corresponding pixel of the target pixel is in the second even field*” as described in currently amended claim 1. Fig.2 of Faroudja illustrates the selection of target pixels from an interlaced NTSC source, along with supporting text Col 7 lines 35-59, where frame 1  
15       comprises block 201 (field 0) and block 202 (field 1), and frame 2 comprises block 203 (field 0) and block 204 (field 1). Faroudja teaches “*samples of chrominance information 210 and 216, which are exactly one frame or 525 lines apart, are being summed by frame adder*” (Col 7 lines 42-43), which according to Fig. 2 correspond to field 0 of frame 1, and field 0 of frame 2. Faroudja also teaches “*samples of chrominance information 212  
20       and 214 which are exactly one line apart are being summed by line adder*” (Col 7 lines 49-50), which also according to Fig. 2 correspond only to field 1 of frame 1. Nowhere in his disclosure, does Faroudja discuss obtaining corresponding samples from alternating fields (either field 0 of frame 1 and field 1 of frame 2, or field 1 of frame 1 and field 0 of frame 2). Therefore, because Faroudja only teaches sampling from a same type of field (0  
25       or 1), he cannot teach the limitation “*obtaining a first difference set between pixel*

*information...the target pixel in the first odd field and the corresponding pixel of the target pixel is in the second even field*" disclosed above. Consideration for the allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4 have been cancelled.

5        Claim 6 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 1 above. No new matter has been introduced in this amendment. Claims 6-7 are now dependent upon currently amended claim 1 above. Therefore, should an allowance be made for claim 1 in light of the above provided reasons, claims 6-7 should also be found allowable as being dependent upon claim 1. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

10        Regarding claims 16-20, applicant points out that these claims are dependent upon or through currently amended claim 1 above. Therefore, should an allowance be made for claim 1 in light of the above provided reasons, claims 16-20 should also be found allowable as being dependent upon claim 1. Reconsideration for claims 16-20 is respectfully requested.

15        **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claim 8 has been amended into independent form by including all of the limitations of original claim 1. Applicant points out that this amendment should place claim 8 into a condition of allowance, as stated by the Examiner in the previous office action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

20        Regarding claims 9-13, applicant points out that these claims are dependent upon or through claim 8 above. As claim 8 should be found allowable, applicant points out claims 9-13 should also be found allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Reconsideration for the allowance of claims 9-13 is respectfully requested.

Claims 14 and 15 have also been amended into independent form by including all of

Appl. No. 10/710,340  
Amdt. dated March 23, 2007  
Reply to Office action of November 27, 2006


the limitations of original claim 1. Applicant points out that these amendments should also place claims 14 and 15 into allowable conditions, as stated by the Examiner in the previous office action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**New Claims**

5        New claims 21-24 have been introduced by the applicant. Claims 21-24 include the same limitations described in original claims 16-20, but applied alternatively to independent claim 8. Therefore, claims 21-24 are found fully supported in the original specification and do not introduce new subject matter.

10       Applicant points out that claims 21-24 should also be found allowable because they are applied to claim 8 above. As claim 8 should be found allowable, being amended into independent form in accordance to the Examiners suggestion, claims 21-24 should also be found allowable as depending on an allowable independent claim. Consideration is respectfully requested.

15       Sincerely yours,



Date: 03/23/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

20       Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.  
25       is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)